

7
8. (Amended) [A] The self-propelled vehicle as set forth in Claim [1] 6, wherein the seat is unirreleable ~~made horizontally turnable~~ by 360 degrees and can be properly fixed at a desired angular position [so that it can convey the person other than the operator].

9. (Amended) [A] ~~The self-propelled vehicle as set forth in Claim 1, further~~ [comprises] comprising a removable supporting bar, said supporting bar [made removable] for supporting the operator riding in a standing position [from the back].

10. (Amended) [A] The self-propelled vehicle as set forth in Claim 1, wherein the self-propelled vehicle is self-propelled at a speed substantially equal to [the humane] human walking speed.

11. (Amended) [A] The self-propelled vehicle as set forth in Claim 1, [whrerin] wherein the driving portion is comprised of an electric motor, and in that a power supply to be supplied to the driving portion is formed to have a small capacity.

12. (Amended) [A] The self-propelled vehicle as set forth in Claim 1, further comprising one front wheel at its front end portion and two rear wheels at its rear end portion, wherein the driving portion can drive drives the front wheel. And Steerable

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1-12. Claims 1-12 remain in the case and are considered to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(4) because reference character 10 and 34 both have been used to designate the self-propelled vehicle. Applicant has submitted proposed drawings changes and believes the changes place the drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84. The Examiner also rejected to the drawings because reference character 33 has been used to designate the support bar and the front frame. Applicant has submitted a proposed drawing change and believes the drawings are now in compliance with 37 C.R.F. 1.84. The Examiner also rejected to the drawing because the drawings do not include reference sign 22. Applicant has corrected the specification and

believes the correction to the specification renders the drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84.

The Examiner objected to the specification for informalities. Applicant has amended the specification to correct the informalities. Applicant is appreciative of the Examiner's suggestions.

The Examiner objected to the claims because of informalities. Applicant has amended the claims to correct the informalities and believes the claims as amended overcome the Examiner's objections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor has possession of the claimed invention. Applicant herein offers explanation of the questions posed by the Examiner.

The front wheel portion is attached to the truck portion as is known in the art, for example by a bolt screw inserted into the top, horizontal plane of the of suspending portion 38 and a bolt screw receiving device on the front wheel portion. Removal of the bolt screw would enable removal of the front wheel portion.

The front wheel portion can be attached to another conveying means such as a wheeled chair when the conveying means is provided with a fastening structure component similar to that of the truck portion of the claimed vehicle. Such a structure would consist of a portion to insert the bolt screw therethrough in order to fasten to the bolt screw receiving portion of the front wheel portion.

The bar handle 21 and steering portion 12 can be changed in direction by adjusting the hinged portions 27. The hinged portions can be fixed at a desired angle and can be adjusted by various mechanical means. For instance, the knob of the hinged portions can be turned to tighten or loosen the hinged portions which allows the handle stems to rise and fall longitudinally. This enables a seated rider to adjust the bar handle structure as a whole to a desired angle. A standing operator can flip the bar handle into a position in front of the front wheel portion by a simple action of adjusting the knob at the hinged portions.

The Examiner questioned about how the front wheel suspending portion is suspended in order to be able to raise and fall longitudinally. Actually, the handle stems rise and fall longitudinally, not the front wheel suspending portion. The handle stems extend out from the

B

hinged portions and the handle stems rise and fall according the adjustment of the hinged portions.

The seat is reversible and rotatable in a 360° arc as is known in the mechanical arts. There are numerous possible structures that would enable the seat to be reversed. For example, the seat can be mounted on a disc base with grooves provided at several angular intervals. An adjustment lever can be positioned to rise and fall to allow the seat to turn and be refastened into a selected groove, thereby providing a selected angle of orientation.

The capacity of the power supply is dependent upon the particular electrical means which would be selected by one skilled in the art, for which there are numerous examples. Any battery that supplied adequate power would be sufficient. For example, two 12-volt, 16 or 24 ampere-hour batteries could be used.

The direction to drive the front wheel can be easily changed as is known in the mechanical arts, such as merely selecting a motor that has the ability to change the direction of drive.

The supporting bar can be fixed or removed as is well known in the mechanical art, such as a clamp-insertion structure that is removable by releasing the clamp.

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims and believes that the claims are now in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 , second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1,2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Brown. The Brown reference teaches a three wheeled freight carrying vehicle with a front wheel portion and a truck portion where the driving portion and the steering portion are disposed at the front wheel portion. Brown also discloses a steering portion equipped with a bar handle. However, Brown does not disclose a self-propelled vehicle that can be used for a backward run as a truck by operating it without the operator riding thereon. The freight carrier of Brown cannot be configured to be operated without the operator riding thereon. Brown does not teach or suggest a vehicle which can be driven forward and rearward and can be used in the rearward run as a truck with the operator not riding thereon. The vehicle of Brown can only be operated from the steering assembly from the provided seat. Thus, sense

B

the direction of movement of the vehicle is opposite to the direction which the operator is facing the rearward run is difficult to achieve.

Applicant believe the present invention as claimed in claims 1-12 is distinguishable over Brown and therefore Applicant respectfully request that the application pass to issue.

The Examiner also rejected claim 9 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown. Applicant reiterates the arguments made above concerning the Brown reference and believes that the present invention would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art over Brown.

The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and further in view of Coker. Coker discloses a front wheel portion that is made to be removable with respect to the truck portion. Coker also discloses a bar handle including a handle stem arranged at the upper end of a front wheel suspending portion to be turned to raise and fall, a handle bar handle bar fixed to the end of the portions of the handle stem. Coker also teaches of a seat with arm rests to eat an operator. Coker also teaches of a self-propelled vehicle that maintains a speed equal to that of walking speed. Coker also discloses an electric motor as well as a power supply. Applicant reiterates the arguments made above concerning the Brown reference. Neither Brown nor Coker disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 upon which the cited claims are dependent upon. Coker does not disclose or suggest the features of the present invention namely, that it can be driven to run forward and backward and can be used for the backward run as a truck without the operator riding thereon. Therefore Applicant believes that the invention as claimed in claims 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art over Brown and in view of Coker.

The Examiner also rejected claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Brown in further in view of Cassano. Cassano discloses a self-propelled vehicle where the bar handle is reversely turned toward the front wheel. Cassano does not disclose a driving portion driving the front wheel. Applicant reiterates the arguments made concerning the Brown reference. The Cassano reference pertains to golf carts and therefore can not be used by an operator to transport another person, particularly an elderly or partial handicapped person. Therefore, given the arguments made above concerning the Brown reference and the in inapplicable of the Cassano reference Applicant believes that the invention would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art over Brown and in view of Cassano.

B

The Examiner also rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and further in view of Benson et al. Benson et al. discloses a seat to turn 360 degrees and to fix the seat at a desired position. Applicant reiterates the claims made above regarding the Brown reference. Claim 8 is dependent upon claim 1 which Applicant believes to be in condition for allowance and therefore Applicant believes that claim 8 is also in condition for allowance. Further, the Benson et al. reference pertains to baby strollers which require an operator to push or pull the vehicle for the seated child. Benson et al. does not pertain to motorized vehicles which can be used either by a mounted seated operator to transport him or herself, or for transportation of the elderly or partial handicapped by a care giver, or for the light industrial use of a truck. Therefore Applicant believes claim 8 would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art over Brown in view of Benson et al.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicant's attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0289.

Respectfully submitted,

March 14, 2000

Date

Michael P. Williams

Michael P. Williams

Reg. No. 43,271

MPW/cmh

WALL MARJAMA BILINSKI & BURR
101 South Salina Street, Suite 400
Syracuse, NY 13202
Telephone: (315) 425-9000
Facsimile: (315) 425-9114

Customer No.: 020874

B